DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 140 TM 850 612

AUTHOR Claus, Richard N.; Quimper, Barry E.
TITLE District-Wide Comprehensive Needs Assessment Study. Elementary Level, Part I, 1984-85.
INSTITUTION Saginaw Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Jul 85
NOTE 63p.; For Part II, see TM 850 614.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Attitude Measures; Community Attitudes; *Educational Needs; *Educational Planning; Elementary Education; *Elementary Schools; *Needs Assessment; Operations Research; Parent Attitudes; Public Schools; Questionnaires; *School Attitudes; *School Districts; School Surveys; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Saginaw City School System MI

ABSTRACT

In Saginaw, comprehensive needs assessments are conducted every three or four years for planning purposes. Conducted during March and April of the 1984-85 school year, this study produces two basically different kinds of information: (1) Priority Need Index (PNI) data which indicate the key functions (or goals) people perceive should be addressed, and (2) attitude (or opinion) data regarding current issues affecting education. The findings are published in two parts: Part I deals with the PNI data; and Part II deals with perceptions of current issues. Both Parts I and II are summarized at three different levels by producing an Elementary Level Report, Secondary Level Report, and System Level Report. Information was gathered from parents, community members, administrators, and teachers. Two thousand one hundred questionnaires were analysed (Appendix A provides a breakdown of returns by respondent group and a study of possible response bias for non-respondents). This report is the Elementary Level Part I which contains the results on the 19 ongoing functions important to the operation of a school district. Eight functions emerged as the highest need areas: personnel; student personal development; library/media center; labor relations; auxiliary services; teacher values and expectations; staff development; and communications/public relations. Thirteen appendices provide various analyses of the survey data. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EVALUATION REPORT

ED263140

DISTRICT-WIDE COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS
ASSESSMENT STUDY

ELEMENTARY LEVEL
PART I

1984-85

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Clans, R. N.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION SERVICES

- PROVIDING ASSESSMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH SERVICES -

Saginaw Public Schools

Saginaw, Michigan

TM 850 612

DISTRICT-WIDE COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY

ELEMENTARY LEVEL
PART I

1984-85

An Approved Report of the
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION AND PERSONNEL
Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research

Richard N. Claus
Manager, Program Evaluation

Barry E. Gdimper, Director
Evaluation, Testing & Research

Dr. Foster B. Gibbs, Superintendent and
Dr. Jerry R. Baker, Assistant Superintendent
for Administration and Personnel
School District of the City of Saginaw

July, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
What is a Needs Assessment?	2
Changes Since 1981 and Guidelines for Interpreting Results	3
This Report	3
How Were the Data Collected?/What is a Priority Need Index?	4
What Were the Nineteen Functions?	8
--Functions Defined	9
MAJOR FINDINGS--ELEMENTARY	12
SUMMARY--ELEMENTARY	24
APPENDICES	27
Appendix A: Groups Surveyed and Return Rates for the 1985 Comprehensive School-Community Needs Assessment and A Study of Item Response Bias: Parent and Community Member Samples	28
Appendix B: Observed Priority Need Index (PNI) Limits for Function Areas and Questions by Respondent Group and System Elementary Total	33
Appendix C: Function Headings and Number of Associated Questions by Respondent Group	34
Appendix D: Saginaw District-Wide Responses to School-Community Survey Ranked According to Function from Highest to Lowest Priority Need Index--Spring, 1985, Elementary Level	35
Appendix E: Elementary Combined Groups--Average "Desired" and "Actual" Responses to School-Community Survey Ranked According to Function from Highest to Lowest Priority Need Index--Spring, 1985	36
Appendix F: Elementary Teachers (EL)--Average "Desired" and "Actual" Responses to School-Community Survey Ranked According to Function from Highest to Lowest Priority Need Index--Spring, 1985	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

		Page
Appendix G:	Elementary Compensatory Education Teachers (ECE)--Average "Desired" and "Actual" Responses to School-Community Survey Ranked According to Function from Highest to Lowest Priority Need Index--Spring, 1985	38
Appendix H:	Elementary Special Education Teachers (ES[1])--Average "Desired" and "Actual" Responses to School-Community Survey Ranked According to Function from Highest to Lowest Priority Need Index--Spring, 1985	39
Appendix I:	Parents (PA)--Average "Desired" and "Actual" Responses to School-Community Survey Ranked According to Function from Highest to Lowest Priority Need Index--Spring, 1985	40
Appendix J:	Community Members (CM)--Average "Desired" and "Actual" Responses to School-Community Survey Ranked According to Function from Highest to Lowest Priority Need Index--Spring, 1985	41
Appendix K:	Elementary Administrators (EAD)--Average "Desired" and "Actual" Responses to School-Community Survey Ranked According to Function from Highest to Lowest Priority Need Index--Spring, 1985	42
Appendix L:	System-Wide Responses to School-Community Survey Indicating Rank by Function According to Priority Need Index (Highest = 1, etc.), Spring, 1985, Elementary Level	43
Appendix M:	Summary of High Priority Needs by Elementary System Total and Respondent Groups	56

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Theoretical Priority Need Index (PNI) Limits Contrasted with Actual District-Wide Function PNI Limits for Saginaw's Comprehensive Needs Assessment Studies 1976-77, 1980-81 and 1984-85	7
2	Top Ranking Elementary Level Function Areas According to Priority Need Indices, 1984-85	13
A.1	Groups Surveyed and Return Rates for the 1985 Comprehensive School-Community Needs Assessment	28
A.2	Chi-Squares Used to Test Differences Between Typical (T) and Late (L) Parent/Community Members on Three Selected Educational Issues	30
A.3	Decisions Related to Chi-Squares of Differences or Lack of Them Between Typical and Late Respondents on Three Questions	31
B.1	Observed Priority Need Index (PNI) Limits for Function Areas and Questions by Respondent Group and System Elementary Total	33
C.1	Function Headings and Number of Associated Questions by Respondent Group	34

INTRODUCTION

In Saginaw comprehensive needs assessments are conducted every three or four years for planning purposes. The last study was conducted during the 1980-81 school year. This study was conducted during March and April of the 1984-85 school year.

The study produces two basically different kinds of information: Priority Need Index (PNI) data which indicate the key functions (or goals) people perceive should be addressed and attitude (or opinion) data regarding current issues affecting education. For this reason the findings are published in two parts - Part I which deals with the PNI data and Part II which deals with perceptions of current issues. Both Parts I and II are summarized at three different levels by producing an Elementary Level Report, Secondary Level Report, and System Level Report.

Information was gathered from parents, community members, administrators and teachers. Two thousand one hundred questionnaires were analyzed in this study (see Appendix A for a breakdown of returns by respondent group and a study of possible response bias for non-respondents). The confidence level and error tolerances for the parent and community member sub-samples were determined. Inferences to these populations can be made with 95% confidence for both groups with error tolerances of $\pm$ 4.3% for parents and $\pm$ 8.2% for community members.

What Is a Needs Assessment?

A needs assessment is a logical problem solving tool. It is usually the first step and a vital component of comprehensive program planning. A needs assessment is not a program change by itself, but it is a method for helping to determine if change is necessary or desired. It provides information which assists in setting priorities for future development and provides a basis for allocating scarce resources.

A needs assessment is a structured process for identifying and documenting the difference between "what is" and "what should be." The needs assessment process determines: (1) the differences which exist between a desired state of affairs with respect to important goals and functions and the present or actual state of conditions and (2) a list of prioritized needs from these identified differences.

In addition to prioritizing needs in terms of the ongoing functions and goals of a district, a needs assessment should provide a sense of direction regarding new or emerging needs and issues.

A needs assessment is a systematic process which asks three relatively simple questions:

1. Where are we?
2. Where do we want to go?
3. How do we get from here to there?

In essence, the results of a good needs assessment form the basis for sound goal setting and planning.

Changes Since 1981 and Guidelines for Interpreting Results

In an effort to improve the study the following changes were made:

- All instruments were critically reviewed by thirteen division or department heads to ensure adequate coverage of important areas and issues,
- Questions were edited to shorten and add more precision (the questionnaires were reduced by between 15 and 25 percent),
- Community members were polled for the first time in addition to parents,
- Eleven groupings of respondents were analyzed separately as compared to seven previously, and
- The functions were increased by adding Library/Media Center and School Board items to be more inclusive (19 functions are now measured as compared to 17 in the 1981 survey).

Because of these changes and the amount of time between surveys, in most instances direct item for item comparisons were avoided. In the main we should regard these needs assessment results as a "snapshot" of how people perceive the district now and where they think we should be headed.

This Report

The reader should bear in mind that this report is the Elementary Level Part I - and contains the results on the nineteen ongoing functions important to the operation of a school district. Also, in an effort to obtain valid data and keep the instruments from becoming too lengthy not all questions were asked of all respondent groups. The Elementary Level Part II which deals with information about current or emerging issues mentioned earlier will be published under separate cover. Taken together, a wealth of information should be obtainable for planning purposes.

The elementary level system-wide responses which follow comprise the basic data set. Immediately following the detailed question by question results will come a "Summary" section which hopefully sets the stage for goal setting.

How Were the Data Collected?/What is a Priority Need Index?

The parent and community member responses were gathered from samples drawn from the various populations while all teachers and administrators were polled. Parents and community members were surveyed by means of a mailed questionnaire, while questionnaires for all other respondents were hand delivered. The "Part I" portion of this questionnaire contains a total of 121 statements about educational services and programs, and the respondents were asked to indicate the following for each statement:

1) In your opinion, to what extent should the stated condition exist? and,

2) From your knowledge, to what extent does the stated condition exist?

The degree to which a difference exists between what should be, and what is constitutes a need. The following example illustrates the response choices used for the survey, how the need index was determined and how the priority need index (PNI) was established.

		Should Exist	Actually Exists
EXAMPLE:	Teachers in our schools take an individual interest in their students?	5	3

A) In your opinion, to what extent should the stated condition exist?

B) From your knowledge, to what extent does the stated condition actually exist?

A)	Should Exist	?	1	2	3	4	5
		Do not know	Not at all	To a slight extent	To a moderate extent	To a fairly large extent	To a very large extent
B)	Actually Exists	?	1	2	3	4	5

The following is a more detailed explanation of the above responses.

SHOULD EXIST	ACTUALLY EXISTS
? Do not know the extent to which the stated condition should exist.	? Do not know the extent to which the stated condition exists.
1 Stated condition should not exist at all.	1 Stated condition does not exist at all.
2 Stated condition should exist to a slight extent.	2 Stated condition exists to a slight extent.
3 Stated condition should exist to a moderate extent.	3 Stated condition exists to a moderate extent.
4 Stated condition should exist to a fairly large extent.	4 Stated condition exists to a fairly large extent.
5 Stated condition should exist to a very large extent.	5 Stated condition exists to a very large extent.

For the example used, the need index was 2 (the difference between "should exist" value of 5 and the "actual exist" value of 3). To obtain a clearer understanding of the relative priority ranking of the expressed needs, it was helpful to also know where on the response scale the difference occurred. For example, a need index of 2 would result from the difference between a "desired" of 3 and an "actual" of 1, while at the same time, the difference between a "desired" rating of 5 and an "actual" rating of 3 also yields a need index of 2. Therefore, to help establish priorities among needs, the following procedure was employed. The needs were weighted by multiplying them by their respective ratings

on the "should exist" dimension. This resulted in a Priority Need Index (PNI). This index takes into account the magnitude of the desire of the respondents to have a given condition present in the school district. The PNI could be thought of then as an automatic prioritizing need indicator.

		Should Exist (Desired)	Actually Exists
EXAMPLE:	The teachers in our schools take an individual interest in their students.	5	3

Should - Actual = Need Index

5 - 3 = 2

Need Index x "Should" = Priority Need Index

2 x 5 = 10

One might well ask what are the limits to the size(s) of priority need indices? The theoretical limits range from a +20 to -6. The upper theoretical limit is obtained in the following situation.

Should	-	Actual	=	Need Index	x	Should	=	PNI
5	-	1	=	2	x	5	=	20

The lower theoretical limit can be obtained in the following two ways.

Should	-	Actual	=	Need Index	x	Should	=	PNI
3	-	5	=	-2	x	3	=	-6
				OR				
2	-	5	=	-3	x	2	=	-6

In the three major studies conducted over the years the actual PNI's obtained have never approached the limits of the scale. The scale is obviously biased toward pointing up areas of concern in that it contains many more points indicating "need" (positive values) than it has indicating "lack of need" (negative values).

Table 1 below illustrates both the theoretical and actual limits under discussion.

TABLE 1. THEORETICAL PRIORITY NEED INDEX (PNI) LIMITS CONTRASTED WITH ACTUAL DISTRICT-WIDE FUNCTION PNI LIMITS FOR SAGINAW'S COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDIES 1976-77, 1980-81 AND 1984-85.

Theoretical PNI Limits		Actual District-Wide Question PNI Limits		
		1976-77	1980-81	1984-85
Greatest Need Possible ...	20			
	19			
	18			
	17			
	16			
	15			
	14			
	13			
	12			
	11	10.3	10.8	10.19
	10			
	9			
	8			
	7			
	6			
	5			
	4			
	3			
	2			
	1		1.5	1.58
	0	0.0		
	-1			
	-2			
	-3			
	-4			
	-5			
Least Need Possible ...	-6			

One can see not only that most PNI's do not go far up the scale (the center is approximately five for the actual data) but also that problems have to be identified in a relative sense. We believe looking at the PNI values that equal or exceed the value that marks off the top 25% (in the case of elementary system-wide questions this value was 6.40) is a useful guide in separating out the highest ranking concerns.

Because PNIs vary more for a particular respondent group than for the system total, the reader may wish to review Appendix B which displays that information. Doing so may provide a more refined sense of priorities within groups.

What Were the Nineteen Functions?

Each function was selected because it represented an important task, process, program or goal in the operation of a public school system. The section which follows identifies the nineteen functions and briefly describes or defines each one.

First, the reader should note that the items chosen to assess the function areas were drawn from a pool of 121 questions. The instruments designed for the various respondent groups varied in length out of concern for both questionnaire length and group's knowledge level with respect to a particular aspect of education (see Appendix C for a listing of the number of questions by function area and group). The definitions of functions follow.

Functions Defined

1A. Educational Programs--Elementary: Learning activities and their management that are the core of the curriculum: basic skills (reading, writing, and arithmetic); curriculum development; gifted and talented program; homework; parent satisfaction with achievement; and standards for promotion.

1B. Educational Programs--Secondary: Learning activities and their management that are the core of the curriculum: basic skills (reading, writing, and arithmetic); student preparation for college; vocational instruction; supplemental courses (computers and gifted and talented instruction); homework; parent satisfaction with achievement; and standards for promotion.

1C. Educational Programs--Special Education: Learning activities and their management that are the core of the curriculum: basic skills (reading, writing, and arithmetic); curriculum development; extracurricular activities; standards for promotion; school psychologists; and social workers.

1D. Educational Programs--Adult and Continuing Education: Learning activities and their management that are the core of the curriculum: basic skills (reading, writing, and arithmetic); curriculum development; counselors; homework; and standards for promotion.

2. Leadership by Principals: Administrative action by principal at the building level to support the teaching/learning process: seeks staff suggestions; emphasizes instructional leadership and supervision; provides for effective two-way communications; and is sensitive to staff and community needs.

3. Managing Facilities and Resources: Provision and use of school physical plant and other capital resources: buildings are well maintained; facilities provide a safe environment for students and staff; energy conservation; current textbooks; and lunch program.

4. Labor Relations: The extent to which labor relations is handled in a fair and equitable manner: equitable salary schedule for all employee groups; reasonable fringe benefits; responsible negotiations with unions; and keeps public informed about labor relations issues affecting the schools.

5. Auxiliary Services and Support Staff: Assistance with curriculum, career and personal planning and decision making: readily available services; help to high school students to explore career possibilities; and help in understanding vocational trends.

6. Communications/Public Relations: The availability and exchange of school system information both internally and externally: school business conducted in manner to inspire confidence and approval; students, parents, and staff informed of policies, rules, and regulations; public express concerns to board members and administrators; public informed of school matters and problems; and accurate reporting to the public.

7. Evaluation, Testing and Research: The extent to which evaluation, testing, and research functions are completed: regular testing of students in basic subjects; evaluation of schools effectiveness by public; staff use of data to improve the learning process; test results shared with students and parents; comparison of accomplishments with achievements; and program evaluation.

8. State and Federally Funded Programs: Seeks and uses outside funds: programs to meet the greatest needs of the schools and special educational needs of minority students (bilingual, migrant, and compensatory education).

9. Personal Development of the Student: Services and activities that are generally non-academic in nature and designed to develop student attitudes: self-reliant, respect for other people, and responsible citizenship.

10. Teacher Values and Expectations: Teacher values, expectations, and abilities that guide instructional practice: belief that all children can learn; knowledgeable of curriculum policies and priorities; speak and write well; available to help with problems; and emphasis on pupil participation.

11. Discipline: The extent to which the schools carry out discipline related policies and procedures: printed policy statement; parental notification of problems; administrative support of teachers in student discipline matters; good discipline; assertive discipline program; and teachers motivate students by rewards rather than punishment.

12. Staff Development: Activities for staff and board members designed to improve knowledge and skills in school-related responsibilities: teachers given opportunity to suggest inservice training; participation of teachers is encouraged; new board members are given an orientation to the school system's operation; inservice training improves the teaching skills of instructors; administrators involved in continuing education; and inservice training programs effectively coordinated.

13. Personnel: Activities involved in hiring and keeping competent school employees: the primary purpose of staff evaluation is job performance improvement; teaching assignments based on professional preparation; hiring practices aimed at obtaining well-prepared teachers; job assignments based on qualifications; and teacher dismissals handled in a fair manner.

14. General Administration: Administrative action to plan and manage financial, physical, and human assets: administrators use suggestions from staff and the public in planning and decision making; closes buildings when situations dictate; allocation of resources to high priority objectives; budget presented and interpreted to community; budget reflects identified priorities; "rainy day" fund maintenance; goals organized to show order of importance; planning is a continuous process; research findings used in planning and improving programs; and positive solution to complaints sought.

15. School Board: Board action to oversee and provide leadership toward the management of financial, physical, and human resources: governs responsibly; allows opportunities for public input; rates the superintendent annually; reaches decisions on the basis of background data; works for local control of education; and provides leadership in meeting the needs of students.

16. Library/Media Center: The extent to which the library/media center serves to support instruction: provides additional instructional materials; seeks teacher input when selecting new materials; informs staff of new acquired materials; allows adequate time for student use; and makes available audio visual materials for classroom use.

What follows in the next section is an explanation of the major findings resulting from an analysis of PNIs. First, function areas are identified where there appears to be consensus regarding the existence of a concern. Then the elements or items within a function area are explored to gain an understanding of specific aspects of the concern. Finally, a summary of major findings is provided to highlight observed patterns.

MAJOR FINDINGS--ELEMENTARY

When all responses by parents, community members, all teachers groups, and administrators were combined, three function areas emerged as the ones needing the most attention (at or above the 6.40 decision rule discussed earlier). In addition, the top three function areas of each respondent group were reviewed irrespective of the 6.40 decision rule. This review was motivated by the fact that averaging might mask one or more functions that could be considered primary by a particular respondent group or set of respondent groups. This examination revealed five additional high priority functions.

The functions were ranked from 1 = greatest need, 2 = second greatest need, etc., by considering: the number of groups giving it top priority and also its order in the ranking. The function ranking in Table 2 that follows is the result of the strategies described above.

TABLE 2. TOP RANKING ELEMENTARY LEVEL FUNCTION AREAS ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDICES, 1984-85.

Rank	Function of Greatest Need	Priority Need Index
1	Personnel	6.93 (SYT-1)*
2	Personal Development of the Student	6.58 (SYT-2)
3	Library/Media Center	6.44 (SYT-3)
4	Labor Relations	7.93 (ES^1-2), 8.39 (ECE-1), 7.76 (EL-1)
5	Auxiliary Services and Support Staff	6.56 (EL-2)
6	Teacher Values and Expectations	6.12 (PA-3), 5.01 (EAD-3)
7.5	Staff Development	7.70 (ES^1-3)
7.5	Communications/Public Relations	6.60 (CM-3)

*The abbreviation in the parenthesis that follows the PNI gives the name of the respondent group it belongs to plus its ranking within the top three for that particular group. The abbreviation for the groups polled follow.

SYT = System total of all eleven groups combined.
ES^1 = Elementary special education teachers in district building level program.
S^2 = Special education teachers at Millet Center and all county-wide service locations (e.g., Holland Avenue and Early Childhood, etc.).
ECE = Elementary compensatory education teachers (i.e., Chapter 1, Article 3, State Bilingual, Migrant and Bilingual VII).
EL = Elementary teachers.
SE = Secondary teachers.
VE = Vocational education teachers at the Averill Career Opportunities Center.
AE = Adult education and ABE teachers.
PA = Parents with students attending the Saginaw Public Schools.
CM = Community members not included in parent category above.
EAD = Elementary administrators and degreed professional/technical staff members.
ST = High school students.

To get a feeling for change over time we can examine the highest priority identified in this needs assessment in comparison to previous needs assessments. The chart below gives the former elementary level rankings of these functions in the past studies.

	Rankings		
Highest Ranking Functions	1984-85	1980-81	1976-77
Personnel	1	2	N.A.
Personal Development of the Student	2	6	3
Library/Media Center	3	N.A.	N.A.

N.A.--Not applicable because no like category for comparison.

The 1980-81 needs assessment identified the areas of personnel (ranked 2) and personal development of the student (ranked 6) in the top six function areas needing the most attention. The 1976-77 showed personal development of the student (ranked 3) among the top three function areas. Note the elementary district-wide summary for the past two studies has been altered significantly in the following: number of function areas, number of questions per function, and number of respondent groups used for analysis/calculations. However, the results do tend to suggest that the areas of personnel and personal development of the student do continue to be priority need areas.

The reader should bear in mind that certain function areas such as personnel and labor relations for example, may appear as a high needs over time because of the personal and sensitive nature of the questions. Not suprisingly people tend to react critically to items which deal with the core of their day to day existence, e.g., personnel evaluations, job assignments, grievance procedures and other conditions of employment. Nevertheless, an examination of the specific questions within these major areas should help determine more about the nature of the problem.

In looking back over time it is apparent that concerns and perceptions do not remain static even when responses are lumped together and averaged. In the 1976-77 survey the number one concern was guidance and counseling and number two was individualizing instruction. This year neither individualizing instruction nor guidance and counseling were ranked because they are no longer function areas in and of themselves. In the 1980-81 survey, auxiliary services and support staff ranked first and staff development third district-wide which is different than the situation this year.

A listing of priority need values for all function areas for the elementary district-wide combined total appears in Appendix D together with a complete listing of all priority need values by function for all respondent groups individually. A more comprehensive listing of the desired, actual, need index, and priority need values for all function areas for the elementary district-wide combined total appears in Appendix E. Similar listings for the other respondent groups appear in Appendices F-K.

At this point attention will turn to items within each of the top ranked functions that equalled or exceeded the 6.40 rule. Hopefully by a review of the high PNI questions within a particular function area a definition of the problem(s) therein will become more evident. The abbreviations for the particular respondent groups used elsewhere will again be employed. A "blank cell" will indicate that the PNI was less than 6.40 and "--" will indicate that the question was not asked a particular respondent group, and "N.A." will indicate that the item was asked but the responses of the particular group were not analyzed for this particular level report.

The high need priority questions follow for the function area of personnel which shows the greatest need for immediate attention.

Personnel Questions	PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Percent of Respondent Categories Indicating High Need
	Teachers							PA	CM	EAD	ST	Elem. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE						
92. The primary purpose of staff evaluation is to improve job performance.	8.01	N.A.			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	6.50			N.A.		29%
93. The personnel department hires well prepared teachers.	7.32	N.A.			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	7.62	6.82		N.A.		43%
94. Teachers are assigned based on their qualifications.		N.A.	7.05		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	--	--	7.42	N.A.	6.78	60%
95. Dismissal of professional employees is handled in a fair and professional manner.	7.80	N.A.	7.42	6.62	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.		43%
96. Principals are given an active role in the selection of teachers for their building staffs.		N.A.			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	--	--	10.60	N.A.	6.66	40%
97. Administrators are assigned to jobs for which they are qualified.	8.77	N.A.	10.02	8.05	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	7.69	7.98		N.A.	7.67	86%
98. Our schools do a good job of evaluating teachers.	8.69	N.A.	7.32		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	9.39	7.33		N.A.	7.55	72%
99. Our schools do a good job of evaluating administrators.	11.57	N.A.	11.06	9.58	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	9.27	7.83		N.A.	8.69	86%

The results on five of the eight questions in this area seem to describe the nature of the problem. The set of four questions dealing with teacher and/or administrator assignment and evaluation practices (questions 94, 97, 98, and 99) had more than 50% of the respondent groups indicating a high need. Again, the reader should recall that these items hit at the core of every employees day to day existence (job assignment, evaluation, lay off, etc.) and and are likely to be critically evaluated. Based on the system total PNIs administrative evaluations and assignments as well as teacher evaluations seem to be the key areas of concern here.

The second greatest priority need area of personal development of the student consisted of three survey questions. All three questions are listed below with the high need PNIs shown.

Personal Development of the Student Questions	PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Percent of Respondent Categories Indicating High Need
	Teachers												
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VF	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST	Elem. System Total	
71. Our schools provide experiences for developing responsible citizenship.	7.44	N.A.	7.42		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.		6.85		N.A.	6.51	58%
72. Our schools teach students problem solving techniques.	8.11	N.A.	9.06	6.60	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	7.29	6.86	7.55	N.A.	7.57	100%
73. Students have opportunities to work with other students of similar and dissimilar abilities and interests.		N.A.	6.65		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	--	--		N.A.		20%

The two major concerns in this area appear to be teaching students problem solving techniques and providing experiences to foster responsible citizenship with 100% and 58% agreement respectively.

The third ranked function area, library/media center, had six questions that help to define its nature. The three library/media center questions with one or more high PNIs are presented below.

Library/Media Center Questions	PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Percent of Respondent Categories Indicating High Need
	Teachers											Elem. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST		
116. The school library/ media center serves as a source for additional instructional materials.		N.A.		6.69	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	--	--	--	--		25%
117. The building librarian asks for teacher suggestions when selecting new materials for the library/ media center.	9.29	N.A.	6.81	7.52	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	--	--	--	--	7.89	100%
118. The library/media center personnel keep the building staff up-to-date regarding available materials.	9.18	N.A.	7.63	7.46	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	--	--	--	--	8.10	100%

Two of the three high need library/media center questions showed percent agreement in excess of 50%. Both questions 117 (librarian asks for suggestions when selecting new materials) and 118 (library personnel keep staff up-to-date regarding materials) had 100% respondent group agreement that these questions define the greatest need in the library function area. It should be noted that only teachers were asked questions in this area and that student input was obtained in a separate study.

The function area of labor relations consisted of five questions. All five questions are listed below with the high need PNIs shown.

Labor Relations Questions	PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Percent of Respondent Categories Indicating High Need
	Teachers							PA	CM	EAD	ST	Elem. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE						
49. Our schools have a fair salary schedule for all employee classifications.	6.73	N.A.	7.62	6.48	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.		43%
50. The fringe benefits for all employees are reasonable.	6.45	N.A.	6.96	6.62	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.		43%
51. Our school system keeps the public informed about labor relations issues affecting the schools.	6.61	N.A.	7.66	7.02	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.		43%
52. Our school system negotiates with unions in a fair and equitable manner.	10.71	N.A.	10.96	10.60	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.	7.56	58%
53. Employee grievances are handled in a professional manner.	9.22	N.A.	8.78	8.08	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	--	--		N.A.	7.19	58%

Two of the five questions (52 and 53) had more than 50% respondent group agreement that these questions define the high priority given labor relations. These questions dealt with the issues of negotiating with unions and handling employee grievances. Obviously teachers as a group were responsible for making this a high need function area and it appears they were most concerned with the perceived fairness of negotiations and the grievance procedure. As with the personnel function, labor relations deals with matters directly affecting each employee and which are obviously likely to be critically reviewed.

Auxiliary services and support staff, the fifth ranked function, consisted of five questions. The four questions with one or more high PNIs follow.

Auxiliary Services and Staff Support Questions	PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Percent of Respondent Categories Indicating High Need
	Teachers							PA	CM	EAD	ST	Elem. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE						
54. Counselors are available to each student in our secondary schools.	6.96	N.A.	7.67		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.		29%
55. Helping the student to explore career possibilities is an important part of the school program.	7.05	N.A.			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.		15%
57. Our school district provides remedial instruction to the most needy regular education students.	7.08	N.A.		7.04	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.		29%
58. Support staff (psychologists, social workers, speech therapists) provide adequate services to students who demonstrate a need.	8.15	N.A.	8.40	9.26	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.	7.11	58%

Of the four questions with high PNIs in the area of auxiliary services and support staff, only question 58 had respondent group agreement at or exceeding 50%. Fifty-eight percent did feel that better support services from psychologists, social workers, and speech therapists could be provided.

The sixth ranked function area, teacher values and expectations, had six questions that helped to define its nature. The four teacher values and expectations questions with one or more high PNIs are presented below.

Teacher Values and Expectations Questions	PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Percent of Respondent Categories Indicating High Need
	Teachers											Elem. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST		
74. Our teachers act like they believe that all children can learn.	7.12	N.A.			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.		15%
75. Teachers communicate effectively.	6.79	N.A.			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	6.88	6.75	6.78	N.A.	6.45	72%
78. Teachers teach at the correct level of difficulty to promote student learning.	7.50	N.A.	6.90		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.		29%
79. Our teachers explain and demonstrate rather than just assign seat work.		N.A.			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	6.45			N.A.		15%

The major concern in this area is the effectiveness of teacher communications with 72% agreement that this represents a high need.

Staff development function area (ranked 7.5) had four items defining its limits. The three staff development items with one or more high PNIs are presented below.

Staff Development Questions	PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Percent of Respondent Categories Indicating High Need
	Teachers											Elem. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST		
87. Our schools have an effective inservice training program for improving teaching skills.	9.12	N.A.			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.				N.A.	6.41	29%
88. Our school administrators are involved in some type of professional development program.		N.A.	6.66		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	--	--		N.A.		20%
90. Teachers are actively involved in the planning, development, evaluation and/or selection of new teaching materials.	6.63	N.A.			N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	--	--		N.A.		20%

None of the staff development items at the elementary level had respondent group agreement approaching 50%. A total of 29% agreement is shown for the need to provide an effective inservice training program to improve teaching skills. The elementary building based special education teacher primarily perceived this as an extremely high need.

Communications/public relations function area (ranked 7.5 also) had four items that defined its nature on the needs assessment instrument. The communications/public relations questions with one or more high PNIs are presented below.

Communications and Public Relations Questions	PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Percent of Respondent Categories Indicating High Need
	Teachers							PA	CM	EAD	ST	Elem. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE						
59. The district conducts business in a manner that inspires public confidence.	8.16	N.A.	9.08	8.40	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	7.37	8.21		N.A.	7.35	86%
60. Our school system provides the general public with accurate reports on its performance.	6.72	N.A.	6.58		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	7.56	7.76		N.A.		58%

Both questions netted more than 50% agreement of high need. There is 86% agreement that conducting business in a manner which inspires public confidence could be improved. There is agreement (58%) that our district could be better in reporting on its performance.

SUMMARY--ELEMENTARY

The purpose of this study was to identify areas of need within the school district. According to the perceptions of administrators, teachers, parents, and community members, the following eight functions emerged as the highest need areas.

1	Personnel
2	Personal Development of the Student
3	Library/Media Center
4	Labor Relations
5	Auxiliary Services and Support Staff
6	Teacher Values and Expectations
7.5	Staff Development
7.5	Communications/Public Relations

The above system total priorities were determined on the basis of combining the results of six respondent groups. In addition, this process included dealing with as many as 121 questions spread across 19 function areas. The mathematical system used to quantify priorities, though not perfect, provides a meaningful way to summarize the data in a systematic fashion. Summarization seldom if ever captures the total complexity of the subject under study, such is the case with the present needs assessment summary. This means that the process of averaging results was complex and the individual who wants to understand what causes an area to be considered a high priority should study the respondent group results by question within a function.

At least three trends were fairly noticeable. First was that the bulk of the areas of greatest concern dealt with ways to bring about changes in personnel, labor relations, and staff development policies to maintain

productive and well-trained school employees. For example, teachers expressed concerns about ways to improve staff evaluation, handling employee grievances, offering an effective inservice program to improve teaching skills, and coordinating staff development programs--factors that in part add up to more effective schools through staff willingness to change and improve while on the job.

The second trend was that communications at all levels needs to be improved. Teachers and the public see a necessity for teachers to communicate more effectively. Both the public and professional staff desire a more "accurate" general reporting of school system performance both in an academic as well as a business sense. Parents and teachers desire school board members to provide informed responses to school matters and play more of a leadership role in communicating needed improvements in school programming.

Clearly noticeable was the trend for respondents to be most concerned with factors connected to the type of contact they had with the schools. For example, community members expressed one of their strongest concerns about conducting business in a manner that inspires public confidence, while parents were concerned more about teachers giving additional help to students having difficulty.

Another useful purpose the reports can serve is for specialized applications such as when the clientele of interest is a single group. The detailed information provided offers insight into what the needs and concerns of a particular group were. Thus the report has many professional uses. For example, the supervisor of staff development can review the responses of elementary teachers specifically and get some feel for the training needs of this group. A couple of aids have been constructed to assist the specialized user with this task. Appendix L, which contains detailed information for

each respondent group by question, should be of great value in translating a priority for a specific group into a full blown plan to address their concern(s). A graphic summary of all functions along with information about the relative need value of the functions themselves and the high need questions within a function area is presented in Appendix M.

Finally, in developing plans to meet the needs specified consideration should also be given to the information contained in the companion document (Elementary Level, Part II) which dealt with the educational issues rather than functions.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TABLE A.1. GROUPS SURVEYED AND RETURN RATES FOR THE 1985 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT.

Groups Surveyed	Count and Description of Individuals in Sample or Population	Returns #	Returns %
Parents (PA)	A random sample of 6,603 parents who had students enrolled in the School District of the City of Saginaw during the 1984-85 school year.	772	12
Community Members (CM)	A random sample of 2,684 non-parents who voted in the November, 1984 presidential election.	159	6
Administrators (AD)	All 123 administrators or degreed professional, technical staff paid March 15, 1985.	91	74
Special Education Staff Serving or Based in Regular Education Building (S^1)	All 133 S^1 special education staff paid March 15, 1985.	105	79
Special Education Staff Based in a Specialized Center (i.e., Millet, Holland Avenue, and Early Childhood) (S^2)	All 56 S^2 special education staff paid March 15, 1985.	24	43
Compensatory Education Teachers (CE)	All 85 compensatory education teachers paid March 15, 1985.	58	68
Vocational Education Teachers (VE)	All 44 teachers at the Averill Career Opportunities Center (COC) paid March 15, 1985.	23	52
Elementary Teachers (EL)	All 351 elementary teachers paid March 15, 1985.	273	78
Secondary Teachers (SE)	All 323 secondary teachers, excluding COC teachers, paid March 15, 1985.	137	42
Adult, Adult Basic, and Adult Continuing Education Teachers (AE)	All 69 adult and continuing education teachers paid March 15, 1985.	24	35
Students (ST)	A sample of approximately 462 students from grades 10, 11, and 12 of both high schools.	434	94

APPENDIX A

A STUDY OF ITEM RESPONSE BIAS: PARENT AND COMMUNITY MEMBER SAMPLES

A study of the preceding Table A.1 reveals that 12% of the parents and 6% of the community members returned questionnaires, or a combined parent/community member total of 10% (931 of 9,287) returned complete instruments. What difference, if any, existed between the 10% and the 90% who chose not to return their questionnaires?

There are a number of strategies to answer that question. A. N. Oppenheim (1964, p. 34) in his book entitled, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement discusses a number of these techniques.

The approach chosen for this study was to compare early respondents with late respondents in terms of their answers to the questionnaire. Researchers have found that respondents who returned completed instruments late closely resembled non-respondents in their attitudes and opinions. Thus by comparing late and early response patterns an idea of whether non-respondents differ can be obtained.

Three educational issue questions were chosen to compare the responses of typical and late responding parents/community members. A chi-square test of significance for proportions was the statistical test of choice. The null hypothesis was that of no difference between the two groups (typical and late respondents) in the proportions responding to any option on the three selected multiple choice questions. The alternate hypothesis was that a greater portion of either typical or late respondents would choose one or more than the other options with greater frequency. The alpha level was set at .05 with a two tailed test being indicated.

APPENDIX A

Table A.2 below gives the cell frequencies and marginal totals of responses per question for typical (T) and late (L) respondents. The calculated chi-square value (x^2) and the probability (P) associated with the calculated value are also recorded for each question.

TABLE A.2. CHI-SQUARES USED TO TEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TYPICAL (T) AND LATE (L) PARENT/COMMUNITY MEMBERS ON THREE SELECTED EDUCATIONAL ISSUES.

124. During the past few years, would you say that the Saginaw Public School system has been getting better in quality, getting worse or staying about the same?

	Better	Worse	Same	Total
T	239	360	153	752
L	39	44	17	100
	278	404	170	852

$x^2 = 2.18$ df = 2

P = 0.66

126. How well does your school board represent the opinions of people like yourself?

	Very Well	Somewhat	Not Too Well	Not Well At All	Don't Know	Total
T	70	281	137	80	246	814
L	8	45	10	7	33	103
	78	326	147	87	279	917

$x^2 = 6.11$ df = 4

P = 0.80

TABLE A.2 Continued

136. How well informed are you about the quality of education in the Saginaw Public Schools?

	Well Informed	Somewhat Informed	Not Too Well Informed	Total
T	176	463	161	800
L	26	52	25	103
	202	515	186	903

$x^2 = 2.06$ df = 2

P = .64

Table A.3 below summarizes the chi-square statistics, their associated probabilities, and the decision relative to each for the three selected educational issues.

TABLE A.3. DECISIONS RELATED TO CHI-SQUARES OF DIFFERENCES OR LACK OF THEM BETWEEN TYPICAL AND LATE RESPONDENTS ON THREE QUESTIONS.

Question	Chi-Square	Associated Probability	Decision Relative to "No Difference" (Null Hypothesis)
124. Saginaw Schools Getting Better?	2.18	.66	Don't Reject
125. School Board Represents Opinions?	6.11	.80	Don't Reject
136. Informal About Quality of Education?	2.06	.64	Don't Reject

A perusal of Table A.3 reveals that the hypothesis of no difference between late and typical respondents cannot be rejected. Thus it seems safe to assume that the responses obtained from typical parents and community members would be much like those from non-responding parents and community members.

TABLE B.1. OBSERVED PRIORITY NEED INDEX (PNI) LIMITS FOR FUNCTION AREAS AND QUESTIONS BY RESPONDENT GROUP AND SYSTEM ELEMENTARY TOTAL.

Limits	OBSERVED PRIORITY NEED INDEX											
	Teachers											
	ES_2^1*	S^2	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST	System Total
Highest Question	11.57	NA**	11.81	12.43	NA	NA	NA	9.39	9.39	13.89	NA	10.15
Highest Function	7.96	NA	8.39	7.76	NA	NA	NA	7.79	6.85	5.65	NA	6.93
Lowest Function	3.68	NA	4.33	3.88	NA	NA	NA	3.58	1.52	1.99	NA	4.25
Lowest Question	0.90	NA	1.33	1.52	NA	NA	NA	1.87	0.48	0.39	NA	1.71

*Groups polled:

ES_2^1 = Special education teachers in district building level program.
S^2 = Special education teachers at Millet Center and all county-wide service locations (e.g., Holland Avenue and Early Childhood, etc.).
ECE = Compensatory education teachers (i.e., Chapter 1, Article 3, State Bilingual, Migrant and Bilingual VII).
EL = Elementary teachers.
SE = Secondary teachers.
VE = Vocational education teachers at the Averill Career Opportunities Center.
AE = Adult Education and ABE teachers.
PA = Parents with students attending the Saginaw Public Schools.
CM = Community members not included in parent category above.
EAD = Administrators and degreed professional/technical staff members.
ST = High school students.

**NA = Not applicable for this particular report.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

TABLE C.1. FUNCTION HEADINGS AND NUMBER OF ASSOCIATED QUESTIONS BY RESPONDENT GROUP*

Function Headings	Number of Questions Asked the Following Respondent Groups			
	T	P	A	S
1A. Educational Programs - Elementary	10	10	10	3
1B. Educational Programs - Secondary	11	11	11	10
1C. Educational Programs - Special Education	8	5	9	1
1D. Educational Programs - Adult & Continuing Education	5	2	6	0
2. Leadership by Principals	6	4	6	5
3. Managing Facilities & Resources	6	6	6	6
4. Labor Relations	5	4	5	0
5. Auxiliary Services & Support Staff	5	5	5	5
6. Communications/Public Relations	4	3	4	1
7. Evaluation, Testing & Research	6	5	6	3
8. State & Federally Funded Programs	2	1	2	0
9. Personal Development of the Student	3	2	3	3
10. Teacher Values & Expectations	6	5	6	6
11. Discipline	7	7	7	6
12. Staff Development	4	1	5	0
13. Personnel	8	6	8	1
14. General Administration	7	6	8	1
15. School Board	8	7	8	2
16. Library/Media Center	6	0	0	0
TOTAL	117	90	115	53

*Code for respondents: T = Teachers
P = Parents and Community Members
A = Administrators
S = Students

APPENDIX D

SAGINAW DISTRICT-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY
RANKED ACCORDING TO FUNCTION FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST
PRIORITY NEED INDEX--SPRING, 1985
ELEMENTARY LEVEL

RANK ORDERING OF FUNCTIONS BY SYSTEM TOTAL PRIORITY NEED INDICES	PRIORITY NEED INDEX										
	SYSTEM TOTAL	TEACHERS									
		ES[1]*	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST
Personnel	6.93	7.96	N.A.	7.65	6.54	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	7.79	6.64	5.02	N.A.
Personal Development of the Student	6.58	7.08	N.A.	7.71	5.42	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	6.78	6.85	5.65	N.A.
Library/Media Center	6.44	7.10	N.A.	6.03	6.19	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	---	---	---	N.A.
Labor Relations	5.86	7.93	N.A.	8.39	7.76	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	4.87	3.29	2.90	N.A.
Staff Development	5.85	7.70	N.A.	6.29	5.61	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	5.89	5.15	4.47	N.A.
Educational Programs-Secondary	5.81	5.43	N.A.	7.04	6.03	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	5.88	5.76	4.70	N.A.
Auxiliary Services and Support Staff	5.70	6.67	N.A.	6.29	6.56	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	5.63	4.66	4.36	N.A.
Teacher Values and Expectations	5.53	6.14	N.A.	5.71	4.34	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	6.12	5.86	5.01	N.A.
Leadership by Principals	5.31	6.66	N.A.	5.73	4.25	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	5.57	5.37	4.28	N.A.
Educational Programs-Elementary	4.96	5.53	N.A.	5.39	4.50	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	4.91	5.30	4.10	N.A.
Communications/Public Relations	4.92	5.38	N.A.	4.73	5.06	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	5.76	6.60	1.99	N.A.
Educational Programs-Special Education	4.89	5.80	N.A.	5.56	5.33	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	4.75	3.43	4.41	N.A.
School Board	4.89	4.84	N.A.	5.60	5.52	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	6.07	5.29	2.01	N.A.
Discipline	4.62	5.46	N.A.	4.80	4.30	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	4.67	5.75	2.71	N.A.
General Administration	4.61	4.87	N.A.	5.35	4.60	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	4.95	4.69	3.17	N.A.
Managing Facilities and Resources	4.60	4.76	N.A.	5.71	4.93	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	4.68	3.92	3.54	N.A.
State and Federally Funded Programs	4.44	6.85	N.A.	5.81	5.48	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	4.08	1.52	2.86	N.A.
Evaluation, Testing and Research	4.42	4.84	N.A.	4.33	3.88	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	5.27	5.16	2.99	N.A.
Educational Programs-Adult & Cont. Ed.	4.25	3.66	N.A.	5.61	5.13	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	3.58	2.92	4.58	N.A.
Average For All Functions	5.30	6.04	N.A.	5.99	5.34	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	5.40	4.90	3.82	N.A.

N.A. - Not Applicable

*Groups Polled:

ES[1] - Special Education teachers in district building level program.
S[2] - Special Education teachers at Millet Center and all county-wide service locations (e.g., Holland Avenue and Early Childhood, etc.).
ECE - Compensatory Education teachers (i.e., Chapter 1, Article 3, State Bilingual, Migrant and Bilingual VII).
EL - Elementary teachers.
SE - Secondary teachers.
VE - Vocational Education teachers at the Averill Career Opportunities Center.
AE - Adult Education and ABE teachers.
PA - Parents with students attending the Saginaw Public Schools.
CM - Community members not included in parent category above.
EAD - Administrators and degreed professional/technical staff members.
ST - High School students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E

ELEMENTARY COMBINED GROUPS
AVERAGE "DESIRED" AND "ACTUAL" RESPONSES TO SCHOOL--COMMUNITY SURVEY RANKED ACCORDING TO FUNCTION FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST PRIORITY NEED INDEX--SPRING, 1985.

FUNCTION	Rank	Desired	Actual	Need Index	Priority Need Index
Personnel	1	4.76	3.30	1.46	6.93
Personal Development of the Student	2	4.67	3.26	1.41	6.58
Library/Media Center	3	4.74	3.39	1.36	6.44
Labor Relations	4	4.66	3.41	1.25	5.86
Staff Development	5	4.69	3.45	1.25	5.85
Educational Programs--Secondary	6	4.70	3.46	1.24	5.81
Auxiliary Services & Support Staff	7	4.67	3.45	1.22	5.70
Teacher Values & Expectations	8	4.74	3.57	1.17	5.53
Leadership by Principals	9	4.70	3.56	1.13	5.31
Educational Programs--Elementary	10	4.69	3.63	1.06	4.96
Communications/Public Relations	11	4.71	3.66	1.05	4.92
Educational Programs--Special Education	12.5	4.74	3.71	1.03	4.89
School Board	12.5	4.67	3.61	1.05	4.89
Discipline	14	4.73	3.75	0.98	4.62
General Administration	15	4.60	3.60	1.01	4.61
Managing Facilities & Resources	16	4.65	3.66	0.99	4.60
State & Federally Funded Programs	17	4.59	3.64	0.95	4.44
Evaluation, Testing & Research	18	4.62	3.66	0.96	4.42
Educational Programs--Adult & Cont. Educ.	19	4.70	3.80	0.90	4.25
Average For All Function		4.69	3.56	1.13	5.30

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX F
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS (EL)
AVERAGE "DESIRED" AND "ACTUAL" RESPONSES TO SCHOOL--COMMUNITY SURVEY RANKED ACCORDING TO FUNCTION FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST PRIORITY NEED INDEX--SPRING, 1985.

FUNCTION	Rank	Desired	Actual	Need Index	Priority Need Index
Labor Relations	1	4.80	3.19	1.62	7.76
Auxiliary Services & Support Staff	2	4.74	3.36	1.38	6.56
Personnel	3	4.79	3.42	1.37	6.54
Library/Media Center	4	4.77	3.48	1.30	6.19
Educational Programs--Secondary	5	4.74	3.47	1.27	6.03
Staff Development	6	4.72	3.54	1.19	5.61
School Board	7	4.72	3.55	1.17	5.52
State & Federally Funded Programs	8	4.76	3.61	1.15	5.48
Personal Development of the Student	9	4.73	3.59	1.15	5.42
Educational Programs--Special Education	10	4.81	3.70	1.11	5.33
Educational Programs--Adult & Cont. Educ.	11	4.78	3.70	1.08	5.13
Communications/Public Relations	12	4.75	3.68	1.07	5.06
Managing Facilities & Resources	13	4.74	3.69	1.04	4.93
General Administration	14	4.66	3.67	0.99	4.60
Educational Programs--Elementary	15	4.75	3.80	0.95	4.50
Teacher Values & Expectations	16	4.84	3.95	0.90	4.34
Discipline	17	4.82	3.93	0.89	4.30
Leadership by Principals	18	4.74	3.85	0.90	4.25
Evaluation, Testing & Research	19	4.71	3.88	0.82	3.88
Average For All Function		4.76	3.63	1.12	5.34

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX G

ELEMENTARY COMPENSATORY EDUCATION TEACHERS (ECE)
AVERAGE "DESIRED" AND "ACTUAL" RESPONSES TO SCHOOL--COMMUNITY
SURVEY RANKED ACCORDING TO FUNCTION FROM HIGHEST TO
LOWEST PRIORITY NEED INDEX--SPRING, 1985.

FUNCTION	Rank	Desired	Actual	Need Index	Priority Need Index
Labor Relations	1	4.85	3.12	1.73	8.39
Personal Development of the Student	2	4.83	3.24	1.59	7.71
Personnel	3	4.84	3.26	1.58	7.65
Educational Programs--Secondary	4	4.81	3.35	1.46	7.04
Auxiliary Services & Support Staff	5.5	4.77	3.45	1.32	6.29
Staff Development	5.5	4.76	3.44	1.32	6.29
Library/Media Center	7	4.75	3.48	1.27	6.03
State & Federally Funded Programs	8	4.87	3.68	1.19	5.81
Leadership by Principals	9	4.79	3.60	1.20	5.73
Managing Facilities & Resources	10.5	4.73	3.53	1.21	5.71
Teacher Values & Expectations	10.5	4.84	3.66	1.18	5.71
Educational Programs--Adult & Cont. Educ.	12	4.78	3.60	1.17	5.61
School Board	13	4.72	3.53	1.19	5.60
Educational Programs--Special Education	14	4.84	3.69	1.15	5.56
Educational Programs--Elementary	15	4.80	3.67	1.12	5.39
General Administration	16	4.73	3.60	1.13	5.35
Discipline	17	4.85	3.86	0.99	4.80
Communications/Public Relations	18	4.76	3.76	0.99	4.73
Evaluation, Testing & Research	19	4.69	3.77	0.92	4.33
Average For All Function		4.79	3.54	1.25	5.99

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX H

ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS (ES^1)*
AVERAGE "DESIRED" AND "ACTUAL" RESPONSES TO SCHOOL--COMMUNITY
SURVEY RANKED ACCORDING TO FUNCTION FROM HIGHEST TO
LOWEST PRIORITY NEED INDEX--SPRING, 1985.

FUNCTION	Rank	Desired	Actual	Need Index	Priority Need Index
Personnel	1	4.78	3.11	1.67	7.96
Labor Relations	2	4.76	3.09	1.67	7.93
Staff Development	3	4.72	3.09	1.63	7.70
Library/Media Center	4	4.71	3.20	1.51	7.10
Personal Development of the Student	5	4.65	3.12	1.52	7.08
State & Federally Funded Programs	6	4.69	3.23	1.46	6.85
Auxiliary Services & Support Staff	7	4.67	3.25	1.43	6.67
Leadership by Principals	8	4.71	3.30	1.41	6.66
Teacher Values & Expectations	9	4.81	3.54	1.28	6.14
Educational Programs--Special Education	10	4.83	3.63	1.20	5.80
Educational Programs--Elementary	11	4.68	3.49	1.18	5.53
Discipline	12	4.75	3.60	1.15	5.46
Educational Programs--Secondary	13	4.69	3.53	1.16	5.43
Communications/Public Relations	14	4.69	3.55	1.15	5.38
General Administration	15	4.60	3.54	1.06	4.87
Evaluation, Testing & Research	16.5	4.64	3.59	1.04	4.84
School Board	16.5	4.60	3.55	1.05	4.84
Managing Facilities & Resources	18	4.60	3.56	1.04	4.76
Educational Programs--Adult & Cont. Educ.	19	4.73	3.95	0.78	3.68
Average For All Function		4.70	3.42	1.28	6.04

*ES^1 = Elementary special education teachers based in (or serving) a regular elementary building including support services of social workers and school psychologists.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX I
PARENTS (PA)*
AVERAGE "DESIRED" AND "ACTUAL" RESPONSES TO SCHOOL--COMMUNITY SURVEY RANKED ACCORDING TO FUNCTION FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST PRIORITY NEED INDEX--SPRING, 1985.

FUNCTION	Rank	Desired	Actual	Need Index	Priority Need Index
Personnel	1	4.67	3.00	1.67	7.79
Personal Development of the Student	2	4.55	3.06	1.49	6.78
Teacher Values and Expectations	3	4.58	3.25	1.34	6.12
School Board	4	4.59	3.27	1.32	6.07
Staff Development	5	4.59	3.30	1.28	5.89
Educational Programs-Secondary	6	4.59	3.31	1.28	5.88
Communications/Public Relations	7	4.62	3.37	1.25	5.76
Auxiliary Services and Support Staff	8	4.58	3.35	1.23	5.63
Leadership by Principals	9	4.57	3.35	1.22	5.57
Evaluation, Testing & Research	10	4.51	3.34	1.17	5.27
General Administration	11	4.42	3.31	1.12	4.95
Educational Programs-Elementary	12	4.58	3.51	1.07	4.91
Labor Relations	13	4.44	3.34	1.10	4.87
Educational Programs-Special Education	14	4.63	3.60	1.03	4.75
Managing Facilities and Resources	15	4.55	3.53	1.03	4.68
Discipline	16	4.59	3.58	1.02	4.67
State and Federally Funded Programs	17	4.39	3.46	0.93	4.08
Educational Programs-Adult & Con. Ed.	18	4.62	3.85	0.78	3.58
Average For All Function		4.56	3.38	1.19	5.40

*PA = Parents having children of school age or younger in their household.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX J

COMMUNITY MEMBERS (CM)*

AVERAGE "DESIRED" AND "ACTUAL" RESPONSES TO SCHOOL--COMMUNITY SURVEY RANKED ACCORDING TO FUNCTION FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST PRIORITY NEED INDEX--SPRING, 1985.

FUNCTION	Rank	Desired	Actual	Need Index	Priority Need Index
Personal Development of the Student	1	4.46	2.92	1.54	6.85
Personnel	2	4.57	3.11	1.45	6.64
Communications/Public Relations	3	4.56	3.11	1.45	6.60
Teacher Values and Expectations	4	4.46	3.15	1.31	5.86
Educational Programs-Secondary	5	4.49	3.21	1.28	5.76
Discipline	6	4.44	3.14	1.30	5.75
Leadership by Principals	7	4.45	3.24	1.21	5.37
Educational Programs-Elementary	8	4.48	3.29	1.18	5.30
School Board	9	4.51	3.34	1.17	5.29
Evaluation, Testing & Research	10	4.41	3.24	1.15	5.16
Staff Development	11	4.51	3.37	1.14	5.15
General Administration	12	4.37	3.30	1.07	4.69
Auxiliary Services & Support Staff	13	4.42	3.37	1.05	4.66
Managing Facilities & Resources	14	4.41	3.53	0.89	3.92
Educational Programs-Special Education	15	4.41	3.63	0.78	3.43
Labor Relations	16	4.29	3.52	0.77	3.29
Educational Programs-Adult & Cont. Ed.	17	4.45	3.80	0.66	2.92
State & Federally Funded Programs	18	4.01	3.63	0.38	1.52
Average For All Function		4.43	3.33	1.10	4.90

*CM = Non-parent community member.

BEST COPY AVAILABL

APPENDIX K

ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATORS (EAD)

AVERAGE "DESIRED" AND "ACTUAL" RESPONSES TO SCHOOL--COMMUNITY SURVEY RANKED ACCORDING TO FUNCTION FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST PRIORITY NEED INDEX--SPRING, 1985.

FUNCTION	Rank	Desired	Actual	Need Index	Priority Need Index
Personal Development of the Student	1	4.82	3.65	1.17	5.65
Personnel	2	4.89	3.86	1.03	5.02
Teacher Values & Expectations	3	4.93	3.91	1.02	5.01
Educational Programs--Secondary	4	4.88	3.91	0.96	4.70
Educational Programs--Adult & Cont. Educ.	5	4.86	3.91	0.94	4.58
Staff Development	6	4.85	3.93	0.92	4.47
Educational Programs--Special Education	7	4.90	4.00	0.90	4.41
Auxiliary Services & Support Staff	8	4.85	3.95	0.90	4.36
Leadership by Principals	9	4.92	4.05	0.87	4.28
Educational Programs--Elementary	10	4.86	4.01	0.85	4.10
Managing Facilities & Resources	11	4.85	4.12	0.73	3.54
General Administration	12	4.82	4.17	0.66	3.17
Evaluation, Testing & Research	13	4.79	4.17	0.62	2.99
Labor Relations	14	4.82	4.22	0.60	2.90
State & Federally Funded Programs	15	4.83	4.24	0.59	2.86
Discipline	16	4.93	4.38	0.55	2.71
School Board	17	4.86	4.45	0.41	2.01
Communications/Public Relations	18	4.87	4.46	0.41	1.99
Average For All Function		4.86	4.08	1.69	3.82

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX											Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS											
	ES[1]*	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST	Ele. System Total
FUNCTION: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS--ELE.	5.53		5.39	4.50				4.91	5.30	4.10		4.96	10
1. Our elementary schools do a good job of teaching basic skills.	6.58		5.71	4.50				5.48	6.44	3.77		5.41	
2. The public is satisfied with academic achievement in the elementary schools.	6.59		8.30	6.21				7.16	6.18	6.35		6.80	
3. Elementary courses of instruction are revised frequently to keep them current.	6.29		4.29	4.33				5.14	4.84	2.86		4.63	
4. Elementary teachers give additional help to students having difficulty.	5.80		5.29	3.90				6.82	6.33	4.68		5.48	
5. Elementary homework is regularly assigned and checked.	4.36		5.05	3.39				3.53	4.20	3.88		4.07	
6. Promotion at the elementary level is based on achievement rather than time spent in the classroom.	3.99		4.17	4.16				4.94	6.47	3.15		4.48	

*Groups polled:

ES^1 = Special education teachers in district building level program.
S^2 = Special education teachers at Millet Center and all county-wide service locations (e.g., Holland Avenue and Early Childhood, etc.).
ECE = Compensatory education teachers (i.e., Chapter 1, Article 3, State Bilingual, Migrant and Bilingual VII).
EL = Elementary teachers.
SE = Secondary teachers.
VE = Vocational education teachers at the Averill Career Opportunities Center.
AE = Adult Education and ABE teachers.
PA = Parents with students attending the Saginaw Public Schools.
CM = Community members not included in parent category above.
EAD = Administrators and degreed professional/technical staff members.
ST = High school students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.
ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS												
	ES[1]*	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CN	EAD	ST	Ele. System Total	
7. More capable students are challenged at the elementary level by means of a gifted and talented program.	3.36		4.22	3.61				3.34	3.73	2.30		3.44	
8. Elementary report cards give parents a clear understanding of their child's progress.	6.91		7.32	5.71				4.42	5.21	4.65		5.70	
9. Elementary parent teacher conferences give parents a clear understanding of their child's progress.	4.57		3.34	3.08				3.13	3.82	2.38		3.39	
10. Promotion standards at the elementary level are understood.	7.13		6.27	6.12				5.25	5.88	7.03		6.27	
FUNCTION: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS--SEC.	5.43		7.04	6.03				5.88	5.76	4.70		5.81	6
11. Our secondary schools do a good job of teaching basic skills.	6.16		8.58	7.36				6.77	7.56	6.32		7.21	
12. Homework for secondary students is regularly assigned and checked.	4.13		7.51	5.59				5.21	5.25	6.51		5.70	
13. Promotion in secondary schools is based on achievement rather than time spent in the classroom.	4.78		7.64	7.39				6.15	6.67	2.90		5.92	
14. The public is satisfied with academic achievement in the secondary schools.	7.93		9.61	7.83				8.10	7.85	6.17		7.92	
15. The Averill Career Opportunities Center provides quality vocational instruction for secondary students.	3.40		3.04	3.22				2.75	3.01	1.89		2.89	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.
ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX											Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS											
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CN	EAD	ST	Ele. System Total
16. Our secondary schools provide adequate preparation for college.	5.82		8.53	6.69				6.74	6.86	6.25		6.81	
17. Secondary teachers give additional help to students having difficulty.	7.59		10.02	8.85				8.36	7.30	7.08		8.21	
18. The more capable students are challenged at the secondary level by means of a gifted and talented program.	4.27		4.60	3.48				4.41	4.58	3.04		4.07	
19. Graduation requirements for secondary education are understood.	4.56		5.09	4.00				4.72	4.91	3.31		4.43	
20. Secondary courses of instruction are revised frequently to keep them current.	6.16		7.19	5.96				5.39	5.67	3.52		5.64	
21. Our secondary schools provide courses and "hands on" experience that deal with computers.	4.98		5.65	5.81				6.08	3.58	4.61		5.12	
FUNCTION: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS-- SPECIAL EDUCATION	5.80		5.56	5.33				4.75	3.43	4.41		4.89	12.5
22. Our school district provides special instructional programs for handicapped students.	2.60		2.65	1.86				3.13	3.01	1.79		2.52	
23. Parents of special education children are informed of their rights.	3.91		2.82	2.99				4.80	2.82	1.30		3.11	
24. The Millet Special Education Center provides quality services for the severely handicapped.	3.32		2.19	1.66				2.56	1.02	0.53		1.89	
25. Special education teachers give additional help to students having difficulty.	3.70		4.05	3.88				--	--	4.32		3.99	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.
ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS												
	EB[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST	Ele. System Total	
26. The special education courses are revised frequently to keep them current.	6.40		4.81	5.11				--	--	3.48		4.95	
27. Special education extra-curricular activities are available for students who wish to participate in them.	--		--	--				--	--	4.62		4.62	
28. The special education student progress reporting procedure gives parents a clear understanding of their child's progress.	6.41		6.86	5.02				--	--	4.98		5.83	
29. School psychologists are available to meet the needs of special students.	9.16		9.29	9.59				6.45	4.71	4.74		7.33	
30. Social workers are available to meet the needs of students who are having behavior or adjustment problems.	10.75		11.81	12.43				6.65	5.31	13.89		10.15	
FUNCTION: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS--ADULT & CONTINUING EDUCATION	3.68		5.61	5.13				3.58	2.92	4.58		4.25	19
31. Our adult and continuing education programs do a good job of meeting the needs of adult learners.	3.36		4.98	3.95				3.31	2.45	3.84		3.65	
32. Graduation standards for adult students are understood.	3.79		4.52	4.95				3.86	3.42	4.44		4.16	
33. Promotion at the adult and continuing education level is based on academic achievement rather than time spent in classes	4.58		4.94	6.13				--	--	5.30		5.21	
34. The adult and continuing education courses of instruction are revised frequently enough to keep them current.	3.74		5.78	5.26				--	--	3.68		4.62	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX											Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS							PA	CN	EAD	ST	Ele. System Total
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE					
35. Adult and continuing education counselors work closely with students in planning their programs.	--		--	--				--	--	4.91		4.91	
36. Our adult education programs accurately places learners so they can make satisfactory progress.	2.94		7.80	5.38				--	--	5.30		5.36	
FUNCTION: LEADERSHIP BY PRINCIPALS	6.66		5.73	4.25				5.57	5.37	4.28		5.31	19
37. The principal is the instructional leader.	7.64		6.23	4.68				4.38	4.66	5.27		5.48	
38. The school's goals and objectives are understood.	6.33		6.08	4.65				5.76	5.79	4.33		5.47	
39. The principal communicates effectively.	7.56		6.69	5.07				6.10	5.72	3.84		5.82	
40. Our principal makes frequent classroom observations to monitor instruction.	7.23		6.11	3.67				--	--	6.15		5.79	
41. The principal works to gain community support.	5.03		4.47	3.39				6.09	5.42	2.78		4.53	
42. Our principal promotes methods that are known to create effective schools.	6.21		4.81	4.06				--	--	3.32		4.60	
FUNCTION: MANAGING FACILITIES AND RESOURCES	4.76		5.71	4.93				4.68	3.92	3.54		4.60	16
43. School buildings are well maintained.	7.59		8.30	7.33				5.63	5.51	5.62		6.67	
44. School facilities are available to students and the public at times other than the regular school hours.	1.93		3.92	2.56				3.58	2.72	2.08		2.80	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.
ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS												
	ES[1]*	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST	Ele. System Total	
45. Our school system provides current textbooks for student use.	5.01		4.09	4.00				4.77	4.56	1.46		3.98	
46. Our schools make available to students a good lunch program.	4.64		6.43	5.79				4.95	1.32	5.75		4.83	
47. Our school district takes steps to ensure energy conservation.	3.42		5.14	3.68				3.46	3.14	3.50		3.73	
48. Our school buildings provide a safe environment for staff and students.	6.42		6.49	6.44				5.83	6.70	2.73		5.77	
FUNCTION: LABOR RELATIONS	7.93		8.39	7.76				4.87	3.29	2.90		5.86	4
49. Our schools have a fair salary schedule for all employee classifications.	6.73		7.62	6.48				5.26	3.23	2.38		5.29	
50. The fringe benefits for all employees are reasonable.	6.45		6.96	6.62				2.73	0.48	2.76		4.34	
51. Our school system keeps the public informed about labor relations issues affecting the schools.	6.61		7.66	7.02				5.42	5.32	3.96		6.01	
52. Our school system negotiates with unions in a fair and equitable manner.	10.71		10.96	10.60				6.09	4.27	2.70		7.56	
53. Employee grievances are handled in a professional manner.	9.22		8.78	8.08				--	--	2.65		7.19	
FUNCTION: AUXILIARY SERVICES & STAFF SUPPORT	6.67		6.29	6.58				5.63	4.66	4.36		5.70	7
54. Counselors are available to each student in our secondary schools.	6.96		7.67	5.91				4.75	3.72	2.32		5.23	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.
ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX											Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS										Ele. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST	
55. Helping the student to explore career possibilities is an important part of the school program.	7.05		6.26	6.03				6.22	5.89	5.24		6.12	
56. Our schools provide placement services to secondary students and adult learners.	4.21		4.01	4.66				4.68	3.59	4.41		4.26	
57. Our school district provides remedial instruction to the most needy regular education students.	7.08		5.18	7.04				6.30	5.65	3.74		5.83	
58. Support staff (psychologists, social workers, speech therapists) provide adequate services to students who demonstrate a need.	8.15		8.40	9.26				6.25	4.55	5.99		7.11	
FUNCTION: COMMUNICATIONS/PUBLIC RELATIONS	5.38		4.73	5.06				5.76	6.60	1.99		4.92	11
59. The district conducts business in a manner that inspires public confidence.	8.16		9.08	8.40				7.37	8.21	2.82		7.35	
60. Our school system provides the general public with accurate reports on its performance.	6.72		6.58	6.23				7.56	7.76	3.19		6.35	
61. Printed copies of clearly stated student policies are available in all school buildings.	3.82		1.33	2.53				2.24	3.79	0.63		2.39	
62. A district-wide staff newsletter is published to keep all personnel informed.	2.89		1.98	3.13				--	--	1.24		2.32	
FUNCTION: EVALUATION, TESTING AND RESEARCH	4.84		4.33	3.88				5.27	5.16	2.99		4.42	18

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS												
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CN	EAD	ST	Ele. System Total	
63. Our district regularly tests students in the basic subjects.	3.30		2.44	2.70				4.49	5.51	2.71		3.53	
64. The district provides the community with information about the effectiveness of its schools.	5.10		4.42	5.12				6.80	6.47	4.65		5.43	
65. Instructional program evaluation is accomplished by comparing actual results with the goals and objectives of the program.	5.37		4.65	3.87				--	--	3.10		4.25	
66. Test results are shared with students.	5.63		5.76	4.37				3.63	2.97	2.90		4.21	
67. The district conducts research concerning educational issues.	4.86		4.11	4.22				5.28	4.81	2.29		4.26	
68. Test results are shared with parents.	4.76		4.62	2.98				6.09	5.95	2.30		4.45	
FUNCTION: STATE AND FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS	6.85		5.81	5.48				4.08	1.52	2.86		4.44	17
69. The district aggressively seeks money to provide instructional programs for students with specific needs.	5.58		4.39	4.34				4.08	1.52	2.58		3.76	
70. Appropriate district personnel are advised of the availability of outside funds, such as state and federal grants, special funds, etc.	8.12		7.24	6.82				--	--	3.13		6.29	
FUNCTION: PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDENT	7.08		7.71	5.42				6.78	6.85	5.65		6.58	2
71. Our schools provide experiences for developing responsible citizenship.	7.44		7.42	5.40				6.27	6.85	5.69		6.51	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS												
	ES [1]	S [2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST	Ele. System Total	
72. Our schools teach students problem solving techniques.	8.11		9.06	6.60				7.29	6.86	7.55		7.57	
73. Students have opportunities to work with other students of similar and dissimilar abilities and interests.	5.72		6.65	4.31				--	--	3.76		5.12	
FUNCTION: TEACHER VALUES AND EXPECTATIONS	6.14		5.71	4.34				6.12	5.86	5.01		5.53	8
74. Our teachers act like they believe that all children can learn.	7.12		6.35	4.63				6.08	5.52	6.20		5.98	
75. Teachers communicate effectively.	6.79		5.97	5.49				6.88	6.75	6.78		6.45	
76. Our teachers emphasize active student participation in their classes.	4.91		5.25	3.48				--	--	4.35		4.50	
77. Teachers work on accomplishing the instructional goals and objectives for students.	5.23		4.64	3.55				5.59	5.26	3.07		4.56	
78. Teachers teach at the correct level of difficulty to promote student learning.	7.50		6.90	4.70				5.64	6.33	5.56		6.11	
79. Our teachers explain and demonstrate rather than just assign seat work.	5.29		5.18	4.18				6.45	5.47	4.12		5.11	
FUNCTION: DISCIPLINE	5.46		4.80	4.30				4.67	5.75	2.71		4.62	14
80. The school has published policies regarding conduct and discipline for students.	3.05		1.73	1.65				1.93	4.20	0.39		2.16	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS											Ele. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST		
81. Parents are notified of discipline problems.	4.38		4.49	3.82				4.82	5.75	1.39		4.11	
82. Administrators support teachers in student discipline matters.	7.09		5.67	5.26				3.52	4.69	2.00		4.71	
83. Our schools have good discipline.	8.60		9.01	7.96				7.77	9.39	4.10		7.81	
84. Our Assertive Discipline Program provides an effective means to handle discipline problems.	5.56		4.91	5.30				6.26	6.03	2.95		5.17	
85. Teachers motivate students by using rewards rather than punishments.	6.40		5.00	3.87				4.73	4.53	6.39		5.16	
86. Classroom rules are clearly posted in each classroom.	3.08		2.78	2.23				3.62	5.71	1.66		3.18	
FUNCTION: STAFF DEVELOPMENT	7.70		6.29	5.61				5.89	5.15	4.47		5.85	5
87. Our schools have an effective inservice training program for improving teaching skills.	9.12		6.15	6.28				5.89	5.15	5.86		6.41	
88. Our school administrators are involved in some type of professional development program.	6.14		6.66	4.83				--	--	4.61		5.65	
89. New members of the Board of Education are given an orientation to the operations of the school system.	--		--	--				--	--	4.09		4.09	
90. Teachers are actively involved in the planning, development, evaluation and/or selection of new teaching materials.	6.63		5.46	4.34				--	--	2.54		4.75	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.
ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX											Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS							PA	CM	EAD	ST	Ele. System Total	
	ES[1]	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE						
91. Staff development programs are effectively coordinated.	8.98		6.85	6.97				--	--	5.23		7.01	
FUNCTION: PERSONNEL	7.96		7.65	6.54				7.79	6.64	5.02		6.93	1
92. The primary purpose of staff evaluation is to improve job performance.	8.01		6.15	5.55				6.50	5.41	2.58		5.69	
93. The personnel department hires well prepared teachers.	7.32		5.98	5.69				7.62	6.82	3.90		6.22	
94. Teachers are assigned based on their qualifications.	6.39		7.05	6.23				--	--	7.42		6.78	
95. Dismissal of professional employees is handled in a fair and professional manner.	7.80		7.42	6.62				6.26	4.44	3.06		5.94	
96. Principals are given an active role in the selection of teachers for their building staffs.	5.33		6.25	4.42				--	--	10.60		6.66	
97. Administrators are assigned to jobs for which they are qualified.	8.77		10.02	8.05				7.69	7.98	3.54		7.67	
98. Our schools do a good job of evaluating teachers.	8.69		7.32	6.28				9.39	7.33	6.25		7.55	
99. Our schools do a good job of evaluating administrators.	11.57		11.06	9.58				9.27	7.83	2.82		8.69	
FUNCTION: GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	4.87		5.35	4.60				4.95	4.69	3.17		4.61	15
100. Our superintendent uses suggestions from his administrative staff, teachers, and community-at-large to assist in planning and decision making.	--		--	--				--	--	3.20		3.20	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX											Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS										Ele. System Total	
	ES[1]*	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST	
101. Our budget allows for allocation of resources to achieve high priority objectives.	6.41		7.27	7.39				--	--	6.00		6.78	
102. The school budget is presented and interpreted to the community.	7.07		8.98	7.19				6.45	6.52	4.12		6.73	
103. Administrators seek positive solutions to complaints.	8.61		6.76	6.51				7.48	7.42	3.48		6.72	
104. Our school district closes buildings when enrollments and finances dictate.	0.90		3.08	1.52				1.87	1.68	1.24		1.71	
105. Our school system maintains an adequate "rainy day" fund.	1.01		3.21	2.84				4.56	3.45	1.21		2.72	
106. Research findings are used in planning and improving educational programs.	6.40		4.23	4.08				4.68	4.80	3.84		4.68	
107. Planning is a continuous process in our school system.	4.25		4.09	3.03				4.97	4.70	2.13		3.87	
FUNCTION: SCHOOL BOARD	4.84		5.60	5.52				6.07	5.29	2.01		4.89	12.5
108. Our school board is a responsible governing body.	7.69		8.13	6.85				6.53	6.23	2.34		6.30	
109. The agenda of the Board of Education meetings provide an opportunity for the public to be heard.	5.45		5.88	5.49				5.45	4.62	0.79		4.61	
110. The school board members make an effort to keep informed.	8.10		8.32	8.35				6.54	5.63	2.18		6.52	
111. The school board rates the superintendent's performance annually.	1.53		3.51	3.08				5.11	4.34	0.00		2.94	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX L

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY INDICATING RANK BY FUNCTION ACCORDING TO PRIORITY NEED INDEX (HIGHEST = 1, etc.)
SPRING, 1985.

ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Questions by Function	AVERAGE PRIORITY NEED INDEX												Function Rank for System Total
	TEACHERS											Ele. System Total	
	ES[1]*	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST		
112. The school board reaches decisions on the basis of background data and input from the superintendent's office.	1.31		1.38	2.98				--	--	2.26		1.99	
113. The school board works to preserve local control of public education.	2.76		3.88	3.37				5.03	3.97	0.70		3.29	
114. School board members are known by the community.	5.64		5.87	6.59				6.91	6.23	4.65		5.99	
115. Our school board provides leadership in meeting the needs of students.	6.70		8.36	7.72				6.90	5.98	3.25		6.49	
FUNCTION: LIBRARY/MEDIA CENTER	7.10		6.03	6.19								6.44	3
116. The school library/media center serves as a source for additional instructional materials.	6.32		5.37	6.69								6.12	
117. The building librarian asks for teacher suggestions when selecting new materials for the library/media center.	9.29		6.81	7.52								7.89	
118. The library/media center personnel keep the building staff up-to-date regarding available materials.	9.18		7.63	7.46								8.10	
119. Materials found in the library/media center are appropriate to the students served.	6.34		6.15	5.58								6.03	
120. Audio visual materials are available for classroom use.	5.76		4.31	4.92								5.00	
121. Adequate time in the library/media center is provided to students to select material.	5.78		5.86	4.93								5.53	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX M

SUMMARY OF HIGH PRIORITY NEEDS BY ELEMENTARY SYSTEM TOTAL AND RESPONDENT GROUPS

F = functions identified as one of top eight function areas.
q = functions for which need questions with a PNI of 6.40 or greater were identified. The number after the q with a dash indicates the count of the items at or above the cut-off point.

FUNCTION	ELE. SYSTEM TOTAL	Teachers										
		ES[1]*	S[2]	ECE	EL	SE	VE	AE	PA	CM	EAD	ST
Personnel	Fq-5	Fq-6		Fq-5	Fq-3				Fq-5	Fq-4	F	
Personal Development of the Student	Fq-2	q-2		Fq-3	q-1				Fq-1	Fq-2	Fq-1	
Library/Media Center	Fq-2	q-2		q-2	q-3							
Labor Relations	Fq-2	Fq-5		Fq-5	Fq-5							
Auxiliary Services & Support Staff	Fq-1	q-4		q-2	Fq-2							
Teacher Values & Expectations	Fq-1	q-3		q-1					Fq-2	q-1	Fq-1	
Staff Development	Fq-2	q-3		q-2	q-1							
Communications/Public Relations	Fq-1	q-2		q-2	q-1				q-2	Fq-2		
Educational Programs--Secondary	q-4	q-2		q-7	q-5				q-4	q-5	q-2	
General Administration	q-3	q-4		q-3	q-3				q-2	q-2		
School Board	q-2	q-3		q-3	q-4				q-4			
Educational Programs--Special Educ.	q-2	q-4		q-3	q-2				q-2		q-1	
Educational Programs--Elementary	q-1	q-4		q-2					q-2	q-2	q-1	
Managing Facilities & Resources	q-1	q-2		q-3	q-2					q-1		
Discipline	q-1	q-3		q-1	q-1				q-1	q-1		
Leadership by Principals		q-3			q-1							
State & Federally Funded Programs		q-1		q-1	q-1							
Evaluation, Testing & Research									q-1	q-1		
Educ. Programs--Adult & Cont. Educ.				q-1								

*Groups polled:

ES[1] = Elementary special education teachers in district building level program.
S[2] = Special education teachers at Millet Center and all county-wide service locations (e.g., Holland Avenue and Early Childhood, etc.).
ECE = Elementary compensatory education teachers (i.e., Chapter 1, Article 3, State Bilingual, Migrant and Bilingual VII).
EL = Elementary teachers.
SE = Secondary teachers.
VE = Vocational education teachers at the Averill Career Opportunities Center.
AE = Adult Education and ABE teachers.
PA = Parents with students attending the Saginaw Public Schools.
CM = Community members not included in parent category above.
AD = Administrators and degreed professional/technical staff members.
ST = High school students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE